

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 7 and 14, 2008

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Sarah Gaulty, Christine Perron, Kevin Nyhan, Cathy Goodmen, Charles Hood, Marc Laurin, Mark Hemmerlein, Matt Urban, Phil Miles, Lisa Denoncourt, and Chris Waszczuk, NHDOT; Dick Boisvert and Beth Muzzey, NHDHR; Jamie Sikora, FHWA; Joe Klementovich, HEB; Jamie Paine, CLD; Cole Melendy and Rene LaBranch, Stantec; Gene McCarthy and Vicki Chase, MJ Inc.; Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant; and Deb Loiselle, Jim Gallagher, Grace Levergood, and Steve Doyon, DES.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Tuftonboro

Rochester

Hudson, STP-TE-X-5229(013), 13100

Auburn

Nashua, X-A000(006), 10136A

Concord X-A000(566), 14426

Pelham, X-A000(415), 14491

Bartlett 14372

Seabrook 12630

Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester 15304

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C

Connecticut River Scenic Byway Phase I

Nashua (Litchfield) 10644

Wakefield 14871

NHDES-Dam Bureau

Thursday, February 7, 2008

Tuftonboro (no project numbers). Participant: Joe Klementovich, HEB Engineers (jklementovich@hebcivil.com); Sue Weeks, Chair, Selectperson, Town of Tuftonboro, and Dick Boisvert, NHDHR

The historical and archaeological impacts created by the replacement of four culverts and the re-aligning of 1400 feet of Lang Pond Road which parallels Mirror Lake were examined. Joe Klementovich presented an overview of the project and the scope of work proposed for the improvements along Lang Pond Rd. Sue Weeks, the chair of the Tuftonboro Board of Selectman, presented historical aerial photographs, maps and documents relating to Native American trails in the area and identified the corridor as the Governor Wentworth Highway. It was noted that the

only period of significant road improvement along Lang Pond Rd. was in 1960. Most of the potential impacts result from the four culvert replacements, and one of the culverts will be extended. There will also be relocation of the road to the west about 16 feet to move it away from Mirror Lake.

Dick Boisvert explained that the area around Lake Winnepausaukee and its surrounding lakes and ponds is highly sensitive, and that Native American and historic sites (a corduroy road) may exist in the project area. The Cultural resources committee requested the completion of a Phase IA and IB: Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment and intensive testing to determine if archaeological resources exist in the areas of impact.

HEB will submit a draft of a scope of work for the Phase IA/IB archaeological investigation to Dick Boisvert or Edna Feighner with the Division of Historical Resources to ensure that all facets of the investigations are covered. Once the scope is confirmed, the town will engage the services of an archaeological firm to complete the Phase IA/IB. It was approximately estimated that the Phase IB testing would require about 25 units, which can be completed in no more than two days.

Rochester (no project numbers). Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD and Dick Boisvert, State Archaeologist, NHDHR.

ROCHESTER BROCK STREET RECONSTRUCTION (CITY FUNDED)

The City of Rochester is proposing to reconstruct approximately 4,900 feet of Brock Street, a local road that connects NH Route 125 and Washington Street (near Spaulding Turnpike Exit 13). The road is lined with residential properties, several commercial buildings, a National Guard armory, the McClelland Elementary School, and the Cimetiere Du Sant-Rosaire (cemetery, date on brick storage facility on site is 1963). At the western extent, the project will connect in with improvements at the Brock Street/Washington Street/Woodlawn Avenue intersection reconstruction.

The proposed project will install new sewer lines down Brock Street, evaluate and provide for improved storm water management systems to better collect and treat runoff, and construct new sidewalks along the entire south side of Brock Street. Storm water treatment improvements currently propose upgrading an existing drainage outlet across a portion of the National Guard Armory (a National Register of Historic Places-eligible property), where an existing easement exists. Work would be located within 25 feet of an existing cemetery on Brock Street. The City is also considering cutting back a row of tall pine trees along the south side of Brock Street to provide more sunlight on the roadway and reducing a winter safety hazard of icing on the street.

NHDHR Determination

Beth Muzzey and Dick Boisvert stated that since there had been previous underground utility work in front of the cemetery, they had no concerns with construction in that area. In addition, they determined that the drainage improvements on the National Guard property would have no effect on historic or archaeological resources. B. Muzzey indicated that there would be no historic property affected by the project.

Hudson, STP-TE-X-5229(013), 13100. Participant: Jamie Paine, CLD and Dick Boisvert, NHDHR.

Jamie Paine of CLD Consulting Engineers updated the group on a slight change in scope of this proposed municipally-managed NHDOT project to construct an approximately 2,400 foot long, five-foot wide, 2,400 foot long sidewalk along the east side of NH Route 3A/Lowell Road in Hudson, NH. The project was originally reviewed in 2005, at which time the proposed sidewalk was to be constructed within Town right-of-way (ROW) from approximately Winn Avenue at the northern extent to Birch Street at the southern limit.

The scope has been modified as small slivers of the sidewalk are to cross on to private property, outside of the existing ROW. Permanent and temporary easements will be required. Much of the project area goes through a commercial strip with few historic properties.

After a review of photographs and updated design plans with slope and easement boundaries identified, it was determined that the project would have no effect on historic or archaeological properties. The original cultural resource effect memo, a No Historic Properties Affect Memo, for the project shall remain in place. The environmental document will be updated to note the change in scope and a copy will be forwarded to NHDHR, per their request.

Auburn (no project numbers). Participants: Rene LaBranche and Cole Melendy (cole.melendy@stantec.com), Stantec; Harland Eaton, Town of Auburn; Bill Herman, Town Administrator of Auburn; and Dick Boisvert, NHDHR.

The following is a summary of the discussion:

Proposed Work and Discussion

- The proposed project consists of rehabilitation of an existing bridge that was damaged during flooding in the spring of 2007 and the Town is pursuing FEMA and NHDOT Municipally Managed Bridge Aid funds for the project.
- The bridge is constructed of a combination of stone masonry and I-Beams embedded in concrete (reportedly built around 1935 per NHDOT inspection reports) and an extension/widening that consists of cast-in-place concrete abutments (built around 1970) with a cast-in-place concrete deck. The cast-in-place concrete portions of the bridge abutments and associated bridge deck must be replaced due to damage caused by the above-noted storm event.
- The stone and mortar portions of the bridge are proposed to remain with only riprap added as scour protection in the immediate vicinity of the bridge footings.

NHDHR requested that an *Individual Inventory Form* be completed for the project and the form is reportedly available on the NHDHR website. The intent of the form is to determine whether the bridge qualifies for the National Register. Because of disturbances caused by the original construction, no archaeological investigations will be necessary.

Stantec indicated that Lynne E. Monroe of the Preservation Company based in Kensington, NH may perform this work.

Nashua, X-A000(006), 10136A. Participants: Gene McCarthy, Mike Long, and Vicki Chase (vchase@mjinc.com), MacFarlane Johnson; Dick Boisvert, NHDHR; and Bob Landry, NHDOT.

McFarland-Johnson introduced the Nashua 101A project and identified the project limits on a plan. Route 101A (Amherst Street) is a four lane road with a left turn median throughout the length of the corridor. The project extends approximately two miles from Somerset Parkway northwest to Celina Avenue. The project involves widening the road from two to three lanes in each direction, as well as adding sidewalks, new signalization, and crossroad approach improvements.

Archaeological resources in the project area were identified in a Phase 1A report prepared by Independent Archaeological Consulting, L.L.C. As stated in the report, there were nine areas of archaeological sensitivity identified in the project corridor. Two of the sensitive areas will be affected by the proposed project; Area 2, north of Round Pond, is sensitive for Native American archaeological resources because of its proximity to the pond. Area 4, on a vacant lot on the north side of Amherst Street between 455 and 471, is sensitive for Euro-American resources associated with the house and barn that were part of a mid 19th century farm. IAC recommends Phase 1B testing at each of these sites consisting of test pits. Mike Long provided details on the nature of the road widening and the depth of excavation that would occur in the sensitive areas.

Architectural historical resources identified in the project area include the Bank of America building at 500 Amherst Street. This is a house that was constructed ca. 1830. The house underwent a major reconstruction in 1985 and a barn was added. An inventory in 1990 found that the property was not eligible for the National Register because of the extent of the modifications. However, an evaluation performed by Preservation Company for the project determined that the house retained enough integrity to make it eligible for the National Register. Only the footprint of the original house, and not the property, nor the newly constructed barn and silo, is eligible. The area was identified for archaeological sensitivity as well, but the project limits do not extend into the sensitive area (12 feet from roadbed). It was also noted that the Fab-brase Factory, which was erected in 1959, was not yet eligible and would not be for the purposes of this project.

A determination was made that a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect stating that there are “No Historic Properties Affected” by the project. The memo would list the recommendations of IAC regarding additional Phase 1B testing in the sensitive areas under “outstanding commitments” and indicate that all necessary phases of archaeology will be completed.

Concord X-A000(566), 14426. Participants: Liz Hengen, Preservation Consultant; Gene McCarthy, Mike Long, and Vicki Chase (vchase@mjinc.com), MacFarlane Johnson; and Ed Roberge, City of Concord Engineer.

McFarland Johnson introduced the project and described the right of way impacts. The project involves improving a five-way intersection at Centre, Liberty, and Auburn Street in a historic residential neighborhood by changing it to a roundabout. The project has been designed so that right of way will be acquired only from one property, the Dewey School, which lies at the southeast corner of the project at the intersection of Centre and Liberty Streets. The roundabout will result in a net decrease of impervious area.

Impacts to White Park, at the northeast corner of the property, and to the private residences at the other corners, have been avoided. White Park is a potential 4(f) resource, and acquisition of a portion of the park could constitute a use of the property. The Centre Street boundary to the White park property features an iron fence that is in disrepair, and initial discussions had involved plans to repair or replace the fence as well as other potential improvements to the park entrance. These improvements are no longer being considered as a part of this project. As there are no impacts to any part of White Park, it was determined that there was no adverse effect under Section 106 and no 4(f) impact to White Park.

Elizabeth Hengen prepared an individual Inventory Form for the Dewey School. She found that it was eligible for the National Register both individually and as part of the potentially eligible Upper West End historic district. The school, which is owned by the City of Concord, was built in 1901 and has been in use as a school building or for administrative offices since then. McFarland Johnson presented photographs of the school, the property that was to be affected by the right of way, and of the entrance to White Park that abuts the intersection. A memorial bench that is located within the right of way area that will be affected will be moved to the front of the school. A crabapple tree that sits behind the bench will also be preserved and replanted elsewhere. (Neither of these landscape features is historic.) Additionally, fencing will need to be placed along the edge of the property to separate it from the roundabout improvement. During the three public meetings held for the project, there was no objection concerning the use of the Dewey School property.

Archaeological sensitivity for the project area was reviewed in a report prepared by Victoria Bunker, archaeological consultant. This report did not identify any areas of sensitivity within the project area due to the construction of Dewey School and of White Park, and extensive earth moving activities that occurred during the construction and maintenance of the roadways and subsurface utilities.

A brief discussion about the landscaping in the center of the roundabout followed. Ed Roberge stated that there are local residents who maintain the small island at the center of the intersection now, and that they have expressed an interest in maintaining the landscaping in the roundabout as well.

A Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect was signed for the project that stated there would be no adverse effects to historic or archaeological properties under Section 106 and a finding of a de minimis impact on Section 4(f) resources (for Dewey School). The signing of this memo concludes the Section 106 and Section 4(f) processes for the Concord Roundabout.

Pelham, X-A000(415), 14491. Participants: Christine Perron and Chris Waszczuk.

The preliminary boundary of the Pelham Historic District was introduced and a brief summary of the two proposed alternatives was given. Liz Hengen explained that the town common once extended across what is now the Fire Station lot and that a road bisected the common as early as the 1890s. This information is in her Town Common Report. The general sense of the group was that Alternative A would likely enhance the common area and historic district by removing the fire station, a non-contributing element. J. Sikora mentioned that Alternative A might qualify as a “net benefit” programmatic 4f if the project has an adverse effect. However, it was agreed that without more information on the historic district and proposed impacts, no determination could be made at this time. Future discussions will also need to address what will happen to the fire

station lot if the building is removed (Alternative A), as well as the need for an archaeological survey.

Bartlett 14372 (no federal #): Participants: Mark Hemmerlein and Charlie Hood.

Beth Muzzey signed the MOA for the project; Jamie Sikora will present the MOA to Kathy Laffey for signature. At a previous meeting, B. Muzzey had requested that NHDOT advertise the property through a larger number of venues than usual. Linda Wilson has identified some list serves for the advertisement of the sale of the bridge to public or private entity. B. Muzzey indicated that she would forward the list via email.

Seabrook 12630 (no federal #): Participant: Matt Urban.

This parcel was brought to the Cultural Resources Meeting because it contains a segment of the Boston-Maine Railroad, which was originally constructed as the Eastern Railroad. The Department had received a request from the abutting landowner seeking to purchase the land covered by right-of-way. The abutter's intentions for this purchase are to facilitate improvements and the expansion of the parking area to accommodate the growth of the business. Because the railroad corridor was previously determined eligible for the National Register, Beth Muzzey requested that the Bureau not approve the sale of this property. If the Department were to lease this property to the abutter, it would need to review with SHPO the proper terms and conditions to be included in the lease.

Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester 15304 (no federal number). Participant: Christine Perron.

This project consists of slip lining or repairing 7 pipes and associated headers at three sites. Four adjacent pipes are located on Hodgson Brook under Interstate 95 in Portsmouth, one pipe is located on an unnamed brook under the Spaulding Turnpike in Dover, and two adjacent pipes are located on Clark Brook under the Spaulding Turnpike in Rochester. There were no concerns that the project would affect historic resources or archeologically sensitive areas; these areas are already disturbed.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C. Participant: Marc Laurin.

J. McKay showed photographs and described the M & L Railroad corridor's stone culvert, located west of the I-93 Exit 5 proposed southbound off-ramp. A unique feature of the culvert is that the deck is composed of bricks supported by angle irons. J. McKay postulated that it could have been used as a cattle crossing, but further investigations as to its uniqueness are required. Consensus was reached that the stone culvert is potentially eligible, and that its removal will be an adverse effect. J. Sikora discussed the applicability of using a programmatic 4(f) net benefit to evaluate the impacts of the proposed removal of the culvert. This approach would be appropriate because the culvert is a contributing structure to an eligible M & L Railroad corridor. Documentation of the line as mitigation would result in an overall net benefit to the corridor. A programmatic evaluation requires less processing time than the full 4(f), and FHWA's regional resource center agrees that a net benefit could be appropriate in this instance.

B. Muzzey stated that presently the eligibility status of the corridor is not known and that there may be certain sections of the line that are no longer eligible. However, if it is assumed that this section is eligible, then the removal of one culvert would not affect the eligibility of the line. Consensus was reached that a net benefit programmatic 4(f) evaluation would be appropriate in this circumstance. If only the culvert is eligible in this area, then obviously the impacts could not be considered a net benefit.

P. Stamnas expressed concern about the timeframe if the line is found not eligible and a full 4(f) evaluation is required. However, it is likely that impacts due to construction would not occur to the culvert until late October 2008, and may even occur in the spring of 2009. J. McKay stated that L. Mausolf, historical consultant; has been hired to document the culvert and complete an area form of the corridor. The consultant has been directed to document the culvert as a priority, as soon as weather conditions will allow. She should easily be able to finish documentation of the culvert by Oct 2008.

A revised Effects Memo for the Salem-Manchester project, which includes both the reduction in impact on the Armstrong properties and the culvert impacts, was signed by SHPO and FHWA with concurrence by DOT.

Connecticut River Scenic Byway Phase I. Participant: Joyce McKay.

The Vermont AOT proposed to have 54 Scenic Byway signs installed within the right-of-way along the routes that parallel the Connecticut River. These routes include from Hinsdale north, Routes 63, 11/12, 12A, 12/103, 10, 302, 135, and 3. The AOT considers the effect of this project as "No Historic Properties Affected" and requests concurrence from the NHDHR. B. Muzzey inquired about how many of the 115 signs would be mounted on posts carrying other signs. Because they don't know whether a historic property is adjacent, she was somewhat concerned about the proliferation of signs at an intersection. If the Byways sign is not to go on existing posts, can it at least be placed some distance from its closest sign to avoid roadside clutter.

This question was subsequently forward to the Vermont AOT. Chuck Wise responded with the following information, which was forwarded to Beth Muzzey:

There are 115 signs proposed for fabrication; approximately 50 for Vermont and 50 for New Hampshire with the remainder for surplus. In Vermont, 95% of CT River Byway signs are collocations with the State's Route Marker signs - that was the directive from the traffic ops folks. In New Hampshire, all signs are free-standing and are a minimum of .1 miles away from any other regulatory or advisory sign - the directive from their traffic ops folks (they rejected all efforts to make them collocations which would be cheaper).

Because these are informational signs, they were situated away from buildings and properties. The goal was to avoid creating a visual or functional impact that could result in disagreement with the property owner. In most cases, signs were installed near utility poles, culvert markers and/or behind guardrail. This was to minimize vehicle disturbance/damage and to minimize the number of objects with the road's clear zone.

In New Hampshire, every sign was located after all the other regulatory (e.g., speed limit) and advisory (e.g., route marker) signs. If there was 4-5 existing signs spaced .1 miles apart each, the CT River signs were located sometimes more than 400-1500 feet from the intersection. I have attached a copy of the NHDOT sign work order.

Thursday, February 14, 2008

Nashua (Litchfield) 10644 (no federal #). Participants: Phil Miles and Lisa Denoncourt.

The meeting involved the discussion of options for the barn roof replacement for an eligible property in Litchfield. B. Muzzey outlined two acceptable courses of action: (1) to install asphalt shingling using existing roof boards (or, if deteriorated beyond repair, replaced in kind) and *without* the use of plywood because it poses moisture risks or; (2) to install a black or dark grey metal roof using furring strips and without removing roof boards. Additionally, B. Muzzey inquired about the condition of the barn's foundation and explained that, ideally, any necessary foundation work should be done before roof work.

Wakefield 14871 (no federal #). Participant: Cathy Goodmen.

The meeting involved a discussion of the historic marker located adjacent to the intersection improvement project at Governor's Road and Route 16. B. Muzzey noted that these markers do not necessarily mark a specific site. Because J. McKay had not expressed archaeological concerns, B. Muzzey determined that "No Historic Properties Affected" was appropriate. A memo was signed.

NHDES-Dam Bureau. Participants: Deb Loiselle and Grace Levergood, DES

Deb Loiselle and Grace Levergood discussed the recent increase in the Annual Dam Registration Fees (ADRF). As a result, NHDES-Dam Bureau has received an increase in phone calls from dam owners inquiring about their options. Two of the options available to dam owners are partial removal and full removal. Based on this information, the Department would like to determine the best and most efficient process pertaining to cultural resources if the dam owner chooses one of these options. G. Levergood provided a few examples of dams in which dam owners have called NHDES inquiring about their options. G. Levergood inquired whether there was a cutoff date or example in which we could overlook the historic process.

B. Muzzey expressed that this is a difficult situation because until the NHDHR has had an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed project, landscape, and structure(s); it simply could not be dismissed. She further noted that structures 50 years and older are the rule of thumb for initiating the historic review. D. Loiselle expressed that she was very familiar with the state and federal regulations and noted that this can be a very costly and lengthy process; especially as it relates to river restoration/dam removal projects. She inquired if there was a streamlined process that could be mutually agreed-upon to make this most efficient for both Departments. Surveys can be very costly to a dam owner and the NHDES-Dam Bureau would like to see if there is a way to provide cursory information to the NHDHR without hiring a consultant. NHDES would like to assist with this initial review so that the burden did not fall on the dam owner to hire a consultant; at least initially. D. Loiselle and G. Levergood acknowledged that based on this cursory information and discussions and/or review by NHDHR, further survey may be warranted. It was emphasized that NHDES would like to work cooperatively with NHDHR to collaboratively work on a streamlined process specific for dams that is most efficient for

everyone. The availability of currently existing forms and/or the modification of existing forms was discussed. B. Muzzey and L. Wilson indicated that ideally a statewide dam inventory would address this question. G. Levergood and D. Loiselle expressed concern; especially with the cost associated to do this work. This is an enormous effort. It was discussed whether the NHDES could provide information similar to the first page(s) of the Individual Inventory Form. This would include comparable photos over the years from NHDES files, location map(s), and comments on the loss of integrity over the years. This will be discussed further amongst NHDHR representatives.

G. Levergood broached the issue of “emergency” dam breaches due to public safety concerns. This has been more of an issue recently due to the flooding events that have occurred over the past two years. B. Muzzey expressed that relative to “emergency” situations, further conversations should occur with Rich Roach (ACOE) to determine how to best deal with these situations as they pertain to Section 106. She also suggested that a Programmatic Agreement between NHDES, NHDHR and ACOE should be discussed.

NHDES and NHDHR agreed to continue discussions on this subject. D. Loiselle noted she would talk further with G. Levergood and others within the NHDES-Dam Bureau, to discuss potential options and recommended process. It was agreed that this was a good approach and that this meeting was a good forum for these discussions.

****Memos/MOA's:** Bartlett 14372 [MOA]; Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-0931(174), 10418C [memo]; New London 14884 [memo]; Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester 15304 (memo); Wakefield 14871 (memo).

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager